

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

TOWN HALL MEETING

CONGRESSMAN TOM UDALL

PUBLIC COMMENT ON DRAFT RFP
LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY

1300 Diamond Drive
Los Alamos, New Mexico
January 17, 2005
12:00 p.m.

21

22 REPORTED BY: MABEL JIN CHIN, NM CCR #81

Bean & Associates, Inc.

23 Professional Court Reporting Service

500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280

24 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

25 (1784AR-MC)

2

1 LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO, JANUARY 17, 2005, 12:00 P.M.

2 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Hello. Hello. Here we

3 go. Okay.

4 Can all of you hear me? We're working on

5 the mike here and trying to get -- to get everything

6 going, so I think they're trying to focus it in and

7 get -- okay.

8 Tom, can you hear back there? Can you hear

9 back there? Okay. Terrific.

10 This is kind of funny lighting here, and I'm

11 going to have a hard time seeing some of you, but I

12 got myself off the stage in here as close as I could

13 to you, so I will be -- I'll be wandering around. Let

14 me -- let me just kind of get some brief comments here

15 and -- and then we're going to turn to you and to your

16 comments and we -- and the ground rules as part of
17 this, I'll get you -- I'll get you information on how
18 we're going to have people comment because we have two
19 different microphones here.

20 But first of all, let me just thank you all
21 for turning out. I mean, it's always a pleasure to
22 come to Los Alamos and see the involvement and the
23 engagement and see how people have turned out. And I
24 am really looking forward to your comments.

25 Many of you have probably, when you checked

3

1 in, got this thing that's titled "LANL Employee,
2 Retiree and Community Town Hall Meeting." The thing
3 that I want to emphasize about this is that, if you
4 haven't read it carefully already, there's going to be
5 two things going on here today. One is, as much as
6 possible and as clearly as possible, I'm going to try
7 to be taking your comments down and submitting them,
8 and I'm doing that with a court reporter. Normally,
9 as you know, I don't do that in a Town Hall Meeting,
10 but I thought it was particularly important in dealing

11 with the NSA and -- NNSA and the Secretary of Energy,
12 that they heard through my Town Hall process the
13 comments that were being made, and we're going to be
14 submitting those comments specifically to the NNSA and
15 making sure that they have them.

16 But you have the option, and I would urge
17 you to do it, independently of this meeting, to submit
18 your own comments. And the website is listed on this
19 -- this sheet. So if you haven't gotten it, please
20 get it and make sure that you exercise your options
21 there.

22 Let me start, first of all, just briefly and
23 generally, and then cover just a couple of quick
24 ground rules. As many of you know, I specifically
25 asked for an extension on the comment period from

4

1 January 7 -- and it was granted. We now have an
2 extension from January 7th until January 21st. We
3 have had the NNSA, as many of you know, out here
4 already, doing their public comment and receiving
5 public comment session, which was done yesterday, and

6 just so that I get a little bit of an idea, could I

7 have a hand show on how many were here yesterday? How

8 many of you were here yesterday?

9 Okay. Well, good. Good. That's a --

10 looking to me like about -- like about half, or

11 something along that line. Just so -- okay.

12 Terrific. So, many of you had the benefit. I had one

13 of my staff members here. I didn't -- I wasn't able

14 to be here, but I had one of my staff members here so

15 I have been briefed on some of the things that were

16 said. Obviously it was a very lengthy meeting and it

17 was great that all of you turned out.

18 Just so that some of you are on the same

19 wavelength as the ones that were here yesterday, I

20 just wanted to give a couple of highlights. January

21 -- July 1st is going to be the start of -- if there is

22 a transition -- now, I think we need to be careful

23 about this -- but the date -- there aren't very many

24 dates here that were very -- specifically that were

25 put out to the public, but the comment period, the

1 extension for the comment period, January 7th to
2 January 21st. July 1st, if there was a transition, is
3 probably the start of that and they were talking about
4 five to seven months in terms of a transition period.
5 And -- and the two individuals that were at the
6 meeting on January the 16th, I guess, Tyler -- Tyler
7 Przbylek -- Przbylek and Robert Archuleta were here on
8 behalf of NNSA to take those comments.

9 So, what we're going to do at this point is
10 I want as much as possible to hear from you in this
11 Town Hall Meeting. And I -- I am going to open it up
12 to your comments.

13 Many of you already know previously that I
14 have tried as much as possible in this process,
15 working up to this to be an advocate for the employees
16 and the retirees up here in this community, and it's
17 my belief -- I just want to say it, at the beginning
18 on the -- on the record, that the University of
19 California should continue on the management
20 contract. I believe that if you look at science and
21 doing big science, there are very few universities
22 that are able to do it in the United States. And

23 while there have been -- there may have been mistakes
24 and there may have been some problems, I think there
25 has been a strong effort by the University of

6

1 California to move in and to have a presence and try
2 to correct some of those things and try to do
3 everything they can to put things right. So that's
4 what -- that's just so that you know, that that's --
5 that's my position and where I'm coming from.

6 And I am coming here to hear specifically
7 from you, from all the different parts of this
8 community that are involved with this rebidding
9 process and the impact that it could have.

10 So with that, why don't we -- let me get a
11 sense of everybody -- and you don't have to -- you
12 know, I'm not going to hold you to it now, but how
13 many of you are intending at this point of speaking
14 for some period of time?

15 Okay. Okay. Well, good. In the hour or so
16 we should be able to cover that.

17 Generally -- generally what I try to do as

18 much as possible is have you not repeat yourselves.
19 If somebody gets up -- and not repeat what others have
20 said. If somebody gets up and says something that --
21 that you agree with, there's nothing wrong with
22 standing up and saying, you know, I agree with that
23 individual and agree with everything. And as we hit
24 some points along the way, I may ask for a hand show
25 just to kind of get an idea of how much the community

7

1 that's come here today to talk about this feels about
2 that, so that we can put that in the part of the
3 record to reflect what is going on.

4 But as much as possible, let's try to open
5 up new areas with our comments and -- and then
6 identify when -- when there's someone that's already
7 spoken.

8 And because we're -- is the court reporter
9 here yet, Tom? Tom -- okay. Good. Okay.

10 So -- so, and we would ask you to give your
11 name and -- and do it in the microphone. The court
12 reporter, I think -- is she -- is it a she or a he?

13 What's the name?

14 Dusti. Dusti. Okay. Okay. Okay. Great.

15 And -- and -- the court reporter will be speaking up

16 if she can't hear.

17 Who has the microphone? Sarah, I think has

18 one. Chris has one here and Sarah has one over here.

19 So why don't we go ahead and start and --

20 Let's start here. I'll keep going back and

21 forth from this side to that side, and we'll start

22 over here. And maybe we'll start in the front and

23 work through the back. Sarah and Chris, start in the

24 front and work back towards the back.

25 Now, could the sound person tell me, do I

8

1 have to turn my sound off while they're on the mike or

2 -- no, we don't. Good. Good. Great.

3 Go ahead.

4 MR. JOE LADISH: First of all, let me say,

5 Representative Udall, thank you very much for coming.

6 This is, within the community, this is a big thing.

7 (Applause.)

8 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: I understand. Thank
9 you. Thank you.

10 MR. JOE LADISH: My name is Joe Ladish, and
11 many of you were at the meeting yesterday. I invited
12 Tyler up -- along with a number of others to
13 coordinate that meeting. What I wanted to say also is
14 this meeting is being recorded by PAC 8, just as
15 yesterday's meeting was recorded by PAC 8, and we will
16 make videotapes available to the library both here in
17 Los Alamos and off the hill in Espanola and so on, so
18 that people will have an opportunity to see this. PAC
19 8 also has a schedule of about eight showings -- I
20 won't go over the dates because of the timing -- over
21 the next couple of weeks, both for this meeting and
22 the meeting that was held yesterday.

23 What I did want to say is publicly to thank,
24 while Representative Udall is here, is Tyler Przbylek
25 for coming yesterday. And what I can say is that the

1 feedback immediately after the meeting were many
2 people felt quite better about what he had said. He

3 had come back with a progress report. So, for your
4 benefit to pass on through your channels, we are
5 pleased that both of you took time out of your busy
6 schedules to come here to address these issues. And
7 Tyler has opened up a channel, he said, for us to
8 continue giving input into the process right through
9 the award.

10 So, thank you very much for coming, and I
11 look forward to hearing more good things coming out of
12 this process.

13 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: All right. And Joe, I
14 know that you have been very active in this process
15 and worked very closely in terms of getting people out
16 here, and I want to thank you for that and for your
17 entire group for doing that because I think it's
18 played a very, very important role.

19 And please, as we continue along in this
20 process, work with us if you run into any difficulties
21 in terms of NNSA or the Secretary of Energy. Okay?
22 Thank you. Sarah?

23 Okay. Chris, right here. Let's -- let's

24 get an idea and work back towards --

25 MS. JANE ENCHER: Thank you, also, for

10

1 coming. I appreciate it greatly. My name is Jane
2 Encher and I'm a technical staff member here at the
3 Laboratory. And quite frankly, I thought about
4 retiring over the last year. I just haven't had a --
5 last year as I had the year before -- okay. I'll
6 speak louder.

7 What I bring to you is the serious concern
8 that's gone on for about 30 years now. And this
9 touches the diversity issue, community involvement,
10 productivity, morale, recruitment and retention. And
11 my question to you, and to Tyler yesterday is, why is
12 LANL the only major DOE facility without a childcare
13 center? We're the only one. We're losing about two
14 million dollars a year in taxpayers' money wasted that
15 the childcare center could, indeed, recruit many of
16 these lost causes due to child care difficulties.
17 That's \$20,000,000 since the Brood and Associates
18 study, which was done in 1995.

19 Several years ago Martha Krebs was here.
20 She announced a child care initiative along with Pete
21 Miller. We were really rolling along, and Joe Delgado
22 secured 1.2 million dollars for a five-year pilot
23 project for a childcare initiative here. An RFP went
24 out. Responses were received. A committee was put
25 together, a selection was made. Everybody was very

11

1 excited. Recommendations were made to Rich Marquez,
2 and it's been on his desk now for at least 18 months,
3 if not two years.

4 Now, I asked Tyler about putting this
5 requirement in the RFP, and he said he would list it
6 in his concerns. My question -- second part of the
7 question, is why on earth would anybody want to do
8 something or put it into their proposal if it's not
9 required? And this is costing taxpayer money.

10 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: All right. Let me also
11 try to see if we can't shake that off of Rich Marquez'
12 desk and see if we can't get it moving. I mean, I --
13 I -- I believe very passionately that having good

14 childcare makes for very productive employees, and we
15 need to move that process along. It sounds like it's
16 slowed down and I'll do whatever I can to make sure
17 that -- that we move that along quickly and my staff
18 members that are here will immediately raise that with
19 Rick and with the Admiral, and try to move it along.

20 Did you have your hand up or no? Okay.

21 Are you getting your microphone fixed over
22 there, Sarah, or are you -- okay. Go ahead.

23 MR. CHARLES MANSFIELD: Yes, Representative
24 Udall. My name is Charles Mansfield. I'm president
25 of the Laboratory Retiree Group, and one of the

12

1 cofactors in putting this series of meetings
2 together. What I would like to -- to point out to you
3 and follow that with a question is that as a result of
4 many of the things that have happened in the
5 Laboratory, especially in the last year, the employees
6 have -- the current employees and retirees have lost a
7 great deal of confidence in both the DOE and the
8 Laboratory management in being able to conduct

9 business. The -- about the only organization that the
10 employees still have confidence in are the University
11 of California and our Congressional delegation. So,
12 this in turn impacts the ability of the Laboratory to
13 retain the type of people that they need and to be
14 able to satisfy the retirees, who give back a lot to
15 the -- to the Laboratory over the years.

16 Is Congress aware of these difficulties and
17 what do you think can be accomplished from your end in
18 being able to support this type of a problem?

19 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Could you give me a
20 little more detail in terms of the problems the
21 retirees are having, what --

22 MR. CHARLES MANSFIELD: The -- the problems
23 are complex. The -- well, the most vocal thing that
24 happened was the comment by the Director that there's
25 a bunch of cowboys and buttheads.

13

1 The -- there's about 3,000, 3,500 Ph.D.s in
2 this community. We take the work that we do, the work
3 that we did extremely seriously, and to be referred to

4 in those kinds of terms has definitely hurt morale.

5 The shutdown. There's questions about
6 whether it was necessary. The Laboratory isn't back
7 into condition. I personally am a retiree but I am
8 working as a principal investigator on two research
9 projects. The funds were granted in July. We could
10 not begin the project in September, and I have to have
11 results by the first of March. So, a time compression
12 resulted. It's affected me personally. It's affected
13 the people at the Laboratory that I work with.

14 So it's these types of things that,
15 especially as far as the retirees are concerned,
16 comments that have come from DOE and other places that
17 say that the benefits are too generous. That -- that
18 is very discomfoting if you are a retiree, if it's
19 said that your benefits are too overgenerous.

20 And the comments -- I believe yesterday that
21 Tyler Przbylek and Robert Archuleta got a very
22 favorable impression of how that -- those types of
23 factors are affecting morale up here, but it's a major
24 issue as far as trying to retain the type of personnel
25 that the Laboratory needs to retain.

1 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Yes. Okay. Okay.

2 Great. Go ahead.

3 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Just one follow up on
4 this.

5 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Sure.

6 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: It has now become much
7 more difficult for retirees to return part-time and
8 share their information and train people, and with a
9 large number of people retiring, we feel this is very
10 important for the future of the Lab and the next
11 generation of researchers. So that's been another
12 demoralizing development.

13 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Okay. Well -- there --
14 just let me say this very quickly, because I'm going
15 to take your comments and probably be visiting with
16 you more as we move along, but first of all, I think
17 the relationship that retirees have had with the Lab
18 in the past has been a very good one. I think we want
19 to support that.

20 Secondly, on the security issues, I mean, I

21 -- I think we -- we did it completely the wrong way
22 around, starting from the top and imposing security
23 issues down. I think we should have gone --

24 (Applause.)

25 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: My sense, all along,

15

1 from everything I have learned from all of you, is
2 that you all are the ones doing the science here. We
3 should have gone to the scientist and the employees up
4 here and said, these are the security issues. How do
5 we design this so that we take care of security and
6 keep the science going. And we did it the wrong way
7 around, and that's what we are having to live with.
8 And I'm going to continue to try to urge all of the
9 people in the chain from the very top down, to use
10 that kind of approach because I -- I think you all
11 care about security. Those of you that work in these
12 -- in these areas where we need the utmost security,
13 you care about that, you want to see it done and
14 that's -- I think some of these other comments about
15 that, they aren't necessarily warranted when they are

16 directed at a large group of individuals.

17 But let's keep moving along with the
18 comments, and I understand exactly what you are
19 saying.

20 Yes -- Sarah, let's start this gentleman we
21 were going to start out with first there.

22 MR. DAVID CARROLL: There you go. My name
23 is David Carroll, and I'm a technical staff member at
24 the Laboratory.

25 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Keep it close to your

16

1 lips, David. That's the key. Okay. Imagine you are
2 a nightclub singer. Okay? Just keep it right up
3 there close. Okay?

4 MR. DAVID CARROLL: Like -- like, Frank
5 Sinatra.

6 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: There you go. Okay.

7 MR. DAVID CARROLL: And I have been a TSM at
8 the Laboratory for 36 years. I -- I have a concern
9 and some questions, surrounding what happens to the
10 group of employees who are 50 and above, because as --

11 as you are aware, Laboratory employees become eligible
12 for retirement at age 50. So, right now I and many of
13 my colleagues are sitting in their mid 50s, at --
14 okay. I think we're back.

15 Many of my colleagues are in their mid 50s,
16 and as Tyler said yesterday, we will have three
17 choices. We can retire and disappear, we can retire
18 and go inactive with the UC system, or we can retire
19 and come back and continue with the new contractor.
20 I'm not as confident in that third option as Tyler
21 seemed to be. He seemed to think that the transition
22 would be transparent.

23 Anyway, as you are also probably aware, from
24 the ages of about 57 through 60 the curve for the
25 amount of retirement, that one gets -- steepens

17

1 greatly, so that the maximum occurs at somewhere
2 around the age of 59 or so. If I am forced to retire,
3 at the age of 57 then I will not have the opportunity
4 to enjoy the extra benefit that I would gain if I
5 could work until, say, age 59 or 60. And I have not

6 heard anyone address this issue, but that means tens
7 of thousands of dollars over the life of my retirement
8 which may be ten or 15 or 20. So, outside of just
9 retiring, and say, at the age of 57, I don't have any
10 way of realizing that additional benefit, and I think
11 that's termination without cause, and I think it's at
12 least unethical, and I think potentially illegal to
13 force someone out of their job to protect their
14 retirement benefits that they have worked for for 36
15 years. Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Oh, thank you. Thank
18 you. Okay. Thank you.

19 Chris?

20 MS. RAMONA GARCIA: Hello. My name is
21 Ramona Garcia, and I basically want to talk a little
22 bit about the future of the new contract and what
23 should be in the RFP. The RFP should require the
24 contractor to correct historical pay inequities and
25 commit to a fair and objective personnel management

1 system. I have not read the entire RFP, but one the
2 things I would like to see in the RFP is a clause in
3 the contract that would limit the amount of money that
4 DOE would give to Los Alamos and the contractor as far
5 as litigation, and this is in terms of when the
6 employees file a lawsuit against the Laboratory. From
7 that standpoint, basically what the Laboratory is
8 doing is taking out these litigations for years and
9 years, and if DOE would set a limit I believe that Los
10 Alamos would have to be responsible for that from that
11 standpoint. So that is something I would like to see
12 in the RFP.

13 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you. Thank you.

14 MS. BETTY GUNTHER: My name is Betty Gunther
15 and I'm on the board of UPTE, the union, the employees
16 union at LANL, and we have a number of concerns with
17 the contracting. We have E-mailed you a copy of what
18 we sent in to Tyler. And you could look at it in
19 detail, but right off -- I also listened to Tyler last
20 night, and I was very concerned. I did not come away
21 all that happy, and the reason is because although he

22 expressed the wonderful things that they were planning
23 to do for employees, those things are not written
24 into -- into this draft RFP. One of the most
25 egregious ones is healthcare for retirees.

19

1 The other thing that came out last night was
2 that the benefits package for current employees is not
3 even one of the rating factors in the rating the
4 proposal. And I believe that that is a serious
5 oversight.

6 There is actually written into it, however,
7 a 105 percent cap on what we can receive. And that --
8 that cap -- he says, oh, don't worry about it. Some
9 of them are already over it. But frankly, I do worry
10 about it because if it's written it can be enforced by
11 law as a part of the contract. I think that needs to
12 be increased or deleted.

13 Another problem is the weighting in general,
14 which I think is biased against the University of
15 California. And the weighting system puts way too
16 much emphasis on the oral presentation and way too

17 little on past achievements and scientific
18 excellence. And we've sent you revised numbers for
19 what we think those should be, but basically the
20 benefits package will not help keep high levels of
21 science here at LANL, and the weightings are -- are
22 put together to only go back five years, yet the new
23 contract is supposed to last up to 20 years. And it
24 seems to me there's some serious oversights in those
25 areas. We have some others, too. I won't bring them

20

1 up now but they are in the mail to you.

2 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you for those
3 comments. Thank you. And -- okay.

4 Could we get something over here?

5 Okay.

6 MR. DAVID O'BRIEN: My name is David
7 O'Brien, and I wanted to kind of echo a little bit of
8 what David Carroll said and maybe explain a little bit
9 further. This is the first time I have heard that
10 there might be -- there might be some things where
11 present employees 50 or over could, in a sense, retire

12 or at least, retire in place and wait until age 60 to
13 actually start getting their retirement benefits, and
14 then just transition right over to the new
15 contractor. The way the RFP is written, it doesn't
16 even allow any of that, because it says you got to be
17 an employee in good standing, which means that you are
18 not retired.

19 So, the question becomes, could it be
20 written in that on September 30th you could retire and
21 then the next date start over again?

22 One more thing. I was at Savannah River
23 when they did their transition, and I think there's a
24 snowball's chance in the Sahara at high noon that
25 that's going to get written in, unless a Congressman

21

1 or basically Congress takes the political heat for
2 double dipping. I'm sorry, but that's the way it's
3 going to be perceived by the press.

4 So, to give DOE credit, they've already had
5 this sort of thing happen to them where they get
6 blasted because they are allowing retirees to collect

7 the UC pension, and then work at full pay with the
8 next contractor. And so they are going to get blasted
9 if they suggest this. I think it has to almost come
10 from outside. It almost, in a certain sense, if not
11 mandated by law, which is probably too difficult to
12 do, at least some kind of resolution or something,
13 because I think if that were there -- I mean, nobody
14 is going to be happy about the transition to some
15 degree, but for the present employees, that would ease
16 it a great deal. Then they could make their decision
17 based on, well, I'll start over with a new
18 contractor. I will do whatever and just start as a
19 new employee with 10 days vacation or whatever, or not
20 worry about retirement and I'll do the other stuff and
21 just roll everything over.

22 I think if that were given as an option, I
23 think the employees would not be happy, but at least
24 be a little bit more receptive to the whole process?

25 Sorry.

1 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you. Thank you.

2 MR. ROY GRINER: Thank you for coming
3 today. My name is Roy Griner and I'm a retiree. I
4 have got two concerns. Concern number one is morale
5 at the Lab and that's been alluded to several times.

6 Pardon me? Oh, closer.

7 The other is the maintaining of scientific
8 and engineering excellence at the Laboratory. It --
9 and I like your comment about how to handle security,
10 where it doesn't come from up above and management and
11 hopefully trickle down, but ought to be a cooperative
12 process between the employees and the managers. And I
13 would like to suggest that safety ought to be another
14 one of those things that's done that way.

15 And a third thing is environmental
16 stewardship.

17 And a fourth, equally important, this has
18 been alluded to for decades at the Lab. There ought
19 to be strong and valued evaluation of management by
20 employees.

21 Another thing that I think would help morale
22 is to have -- have employees have a say in the scoring
23 of contractors in this RFP process.

24 Now, about scientific and engineering
25 excellence, it would seem that the bidders ought to be

23

1 scored on at least ten years of their history in this
2 regard. And I would like to see something a little
3 more specific than just scientific and engineering
4 excellence, but it ought to be excellence in managing
5 nuclear defense research.

6 And another thing that ought to be in
7 there -- and maybe this is even more important than
8 nuclear defense research, it ought to be -- what ought
9 to be in there is energy independence for the United
10 States. That's something that's got to be done,
11 within the lifetime of this contract.

12 (Applause.)

13 One final thing. Before you leave, I would
14 like to -- I would like to endorse your words about
15 the University of California. I think I, as a
16 retiree, would like to see the University of
17 California continue. I think that would be -- I think
18 that would give me a real sigh of relief here.

19 And before you leave, I would like to see

20 how many in the audience would like to see the

21 University of California continue, and maybe --

22 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Let's do a hand show on

23 that for -- let's --

24 What would you all estimate? What is a good

25 estimate there? Is that --

24

1 MR. ROY GRINER: Well, you could ask how

2 many would not like to see the University of

3 California continue.

4 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Well, and there's --

5 MR. ROY GRINER: Okay.

6 How many would like to see the University of

7 California have the government outsource the DOE to

8 the University of California?

9 (Applause.)

10 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Just for the record

11 here, there was a very significant number, an

12 overwhelming number, I think, that were supporting the

13 University of California and I think there were

14 several hands that were of the office of the "youth."

15 Sarah?

16 MS. DEBBIE CLARK: Thank you, I have been
17 following our --

18 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Hold it close there.

19 MR. DEBBIE CLARK: Sorry. It seemed close.

20 I have been following or RFP since last
21 Thursday, and I would guess some amount of people
22 here, because I sent out E-mails to employees
23 saying -- or forgot to say my name -- Debbie Clark --
24 saying please look at the RFP and show up to some of
25 these meetings. I came to the meeting yesterday and

25

1 listened to Tyler.

2 I will be brief here, and if you want me to
3 explain any of these things, I can do it. I would
4 like -- well, in the contract it calls for our
5 benefits to be held to 105 percent cap. They are
6 already at the 105 percent cap. The only benefit --
7 and Tyler and his friends agreed with this
8 yesterday -- the only benefit that's over, excessively

9 over the 105 percent is a 175 percent retirement. So
10 that is the -- what they are going to have to change
11 to get our benefits back to the 105 percent cap, is
12 take lower the retirement benefit.

13 Right now, if a person stays long enough,
14 the multiplier times your years of service with UC is
15 2.5 percent at age 60. Compared to newer DOE
16 contracts that is really high. Oak Ridge is at about
17 1.5 percent multiplier. If a person worked 30 years
18 they could get about 45 percent retirement. Perhaps
19 we would like to see the multipliers called out in the
20 contract as being maybe not 2.5, but maybe 2,
21 something reasonable for people's lifetime work.

22 The last thing that really, really concerned
23 me yesterday was the list that people make. Current
24 employees with a lot of years of service, but not
25 enough age to retire comfortably under the contract

26

1 can transfer straight across and their years become
2 the new company, and their benefit money goes with
3 them. They can quit. People call it saving your UC

4 -- made inactive in the system.

5 I asked yesterday, and it is quit and then
6 apply to the new company, or you can retire and take
7 whatever path you want to take since then. A person
8 like me, with many years of UC service and no age when
9 it comes to retirement, could take my 27 years and
10 decide to quit, go to the new company, I'm a new
11 employee, new vacation, no seniority towards any kind
12 of retirement with that company, towards any kind of
13 severance pay should I ever get laid off. And I think
14 those are kind of devil's choices. Thank you.

15 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you. Thank you.

16 MR. MARK ____: Okay. Tom, how are you?

17 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Hello. How are you
18 doing, Mark?

19 MR. MARK ____: Oh, the normal. To
20 continue on the 5 percent cap, you know, one of the
21 things is that, as we have said, we wish we could
22 change the DOE, not the -- we wish we could change the
23 DOE, not the UC, but I wish the Congressional
24 delegation would remind people that the UC's original

25 role was essentially paychecks and benefits, not

27

1 management. The AEC reserved itself that right, and
2 to the extent the DOE is willing to take
3 responsibility, it still has that right, and when Joe
4 Barton says he wants to know how the UC can be charged
5 for the cost of the shutdown, he should remember he
6 was here with the Congressional committee essentially
7 the day after Pete Nanos announced that, or the day
8 before. So, when Congress wants to be in charge it's
9 in charge, but when they need a whipping boy, they
10 have the UC. And we do need to remember that at the
11 back of all this and hope that our Congressional
12 delegation will bring it forward.

13 Now, I think we can't resolve everything,
14 but I think one way of correcting many of the issues
15 about the 5 percent cap is to change the current
16 language which says, when net benefit value and/or per
17 capita costs exceed the comparative group, to when the
18 per capita costs exceed the comparative group, or the
19 value of benefits drops below 5 percent -- 95 percent.

20 I guess there are many other aspects, but we
21 really do need for you guys to auger into that one and
22 then make sure that these things are accountable in
23 the RFP process, because it's incredible how much
24 language is in the RFP that is then not judged.
25 That's unfair to everybody, including the proposers.

28

1 Thank you.
2 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.
3 MR. ROBERT CARES: Congressman, hi. I'm
4 Robert Cares. I'm a technical staff member in X
5 Division, and I want to make some comments about --
6 about this pension issue. The way the current draft
7 RFP is written provides an enormous disincentive for
8 employees to stay at the Laboratory. It's basically
9 if the University of California fails to win the
10 contract, a new pension plan will be created and the
11 -- the transferring employees will be dumped into the
12 new pension plan, and there is absolutely no guarantee
13 in the draft RFP of what those benefits will be in
14 that plan. And, in fact, there is language in the

15 draft RFP which suggests that there will be
16 significant cuts in the pension benefits over time
17 because there is a provision in there, in Section
18 H-36, which talks about yearly -- yearly reviews of
19 those benefits and bringing them in line with this 105
20 percent cap.

21 Now, DOE has already published a benefit
22 value survey showing that the University of California
23 pension plan is about 300 percent above the average of
24 the comparative group, so clearly the trend here is
25 going to be towards cutting pension benefits, and I

29

1 think it puts employees with a lot of University of
2 California service credit in the position of deciding
3 whether they want to keep their job or whether they
4 want to keep their University of California pension
5 benefits. And since those benefits are probably the
6 largest single financial asset that most of us have,
7 we're going to be given the option of either retiring
8 or simply terminating from the Laboratory before the
9 contract changes over.

10 Now, I made a proposal to Ambassador Brooks
11 and to the Source Evaluation Board a few weeks ago to
12 provide a third alternative, and that was the option
13 to essentially leave your years of UC service credit
14 in UCRP, and start a new pension with the new
15 contractor. And that could be written into section
16 H-36F of the draft RFP, and I would like to suggest
17 that that be considered. I am basically here asking
18 for your support of that idea --

19 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Right.

20 MR. ROBERT CARES: -- and I provided your
21 staff with a bunch of written materials before faxing
22 them a cover letter, and I have already sent you some
23 of that material.

24 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you. Very good
25 comment. Thank you. Thank you.

30

1 MR. GERALD STRIKE: My name is Gerald
2 Strike, and my salient point is that I'm looking at
3 considering retirement in about five years, so I want
4 to second the comments of Mr. Carroll and speaker who

5 just spoke, so I will keep it very brief. I would
6 like to be able to leave my UC pension benefits
7 inactive, and yet go to work for the new contractor
8 for four or five years and not have assets transferred
9 over to a new pension plan, which is -- has no
10 safeguards. That would actually be a great benefit to
11 the new contractor, because if all of us leave our
12 money in the UCRP, they don't have to deal with that,
13 quote, inflated benefit, and it would be easier for
14 them to bring that -- your new benefit package down to
15 the cap if they have to.

16 So it would be win-win if I can leave my
17 UCRP where it is and work for the new contractor. I
18 don't want to have to apply to the new contractor. I
19 would like to just transition over as an employee, but
20 leave my pension where it is. Thank you.

21 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.

22 MS. BARBARA HENDERSON: My name is Barbara
23 Henderson. I wanted to comment on the issue of
24 morale. We have a number of people today and
25 yesterday have spoken on the concern about the morale

1 of the Laboratory. I would like to say that as the
2 Laboratory goes, so goes the community. And the
3 morale of the community is significantly at risk
4 here. The medical community, the mental health
5 community, the religious community, the educational
6 community and the business community are all suffering
7 from this dysfunction and the instability of the town
8 at this point. There are more houses on the market
9 than any time that I could remember in the past 25 to
10 27 years. And everyone that lives in this community
11 is concerned about the resolution of this issue, not
12 just employees.

13 (Applause.)

14 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.

15 MR. RON MOSES: Congressman, Ron Moses.

16 Good to see you. Thank you so much for coming here.

17 I would really like to address a couple of points that
18 are close to what have been spoken to before. But
19 first of all, I would like to really hone in on the
20 issue of why is this morale situation so serious. It
21 isn't just the contracting, that would be bad enough,

22 but we're at the confluence of two very serious
23 events. We have the shutdown last summer. The safety
24 incident was -- was bad, and we'll all agree to that.
25 The director never really did, to my knowledge, own up

32

1 to the story that he -- I believe, said privately to
2 the fellows, and that is, that the security incident
3 traced back to a clerical error, not real lost discs.
4 We have never really seen that explained totally in
5 the press.

6 And, then he went on to carry out the
7 shutdown. If it had been a short, sharp, surgical
8 expunging of the problems, punishing and removing the
9 people responsible, and a brief shutdown to focus in
10 on the general security issues, identify them
11 correctly and get the Laboratory back up and running,
12 that would have been something that I would have
13 personally supported. When he originally entered into
14 this, I supported this. But it went on. It dragged
15 on for months. In some places it is still dragging
16 on. What the Laboratory management chose to do was

17 immerse the whole Laboratory in what I would call an
18 antiseptic bath of bureaucracy, and I don't think it's
19 done any good.

20 (Applause.)

21 I don't think it's done any good. I think
22 it's done more harm.

23 Now we come around to the next thing, what's
24 it done? It has cost our sponsors hundreds of
25 millions of dollars.

33

1 Well, Representative Barton of Texas comes
2 back and wants to blame the UC folks for that. Well,
3 both cookies, that's not where it started, not the
4 UC. It started with the director here, and the DOE
5 supporting this set of actions. That's where the
6 problem rests is with these folks.

7 So now, what quandary we are faced with is
8 agencies outside of the DOE itself, which must bring
9 its work to a Laboratory like this are, frankly,
10 backing off. I know of grants that are not being
11 extended, programs not being extended, some of the

12 Laboratory's very top scientific programs, people that
13 I know personally are making arrangements, making
14 contingency plans to leave and go elsewhere, take the
15 best science out of this Laboratory and take it to
16 places like Jet Propulsion Laboratory or San Diego,
17 take it to other parts of the country outside, as far
18 removed from the DOE as possible. This is a real
19 likelihood.

20 So, with this confluence of events coming
21 along with the contract situation, we now have a
22 situation where, I would guess of my personal
23 associates, people from the mid 50s and up are making
24 very serious plans to leave. I would expect there
25 that we'll probably lose about a quarter, 20 to 25

34

1 percent of our senior staff at the Laboratory.

2 This blows a hole in the transition of the
3 knowledge base here, the corporate knowledge from the
4 senior staff to the younger staff. It just blows a
5 hole in it. It is against the national security,
6 quite frankly. So, these two things coming together

7 have huge national security implications.

8 So, with respect to the contract, yes,
9 changes are coming up. We know that, that there will
10 be changes. We can't avoid that. But the problem is
11 that many of the changes will not be written down
12 specifically and described precisely until it's too
13 late to avoid being changed ourselves.

14 I wasn't here, unfortunately, for Tyler's
15 presentation yesterday, but I don't trust something
16 that isn't down in writing. So --

17 (Applause.)

18 It's very -- it's the very large fraction of
19 people of retirement age are telling me that they
20 simply must opt for their personal interest. I know
21 if we go out in the community, the world at large, if
22 this shows up on Dan Rather, it's going to look like
23 those selfish, greedy scientists at Los Alamos. If
24 they are standing in this position, after you have
25 worked your career -- the gentleman over here said

1 most of us have our life savings in this -- you have

2 to act to your self interest and leave, bottom line.

3 So, if we can't have specific writing before

4 the change is made, that is what will happen.

5 Thank so you much.

6 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. JIM GROSS: My name is Jim Gross. When

9 the contract changes --

10 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Closer, Jim.

11 MR. JIM GROSS: When the contract changes in

12 October, I will be here three-quarters of a year, so

13 I'm a relatively new employee, but I'm concerned

14 because I spent 21 years at another DOE facility where

15 the contract was rebid every five years, and we were

16 always told your benefits will be preserved, and they

17 never were. We always lost something, might be

18 vacation, sick leave. They did change the retirement

19 formula. But they allowed people to at least keep the

20 formula that was in effect when they started, I'll

21 give them that credit.

22 But another item that hasn't been addressed,

23 at least I haven't heard, is the work environment.
24 It's really different here. For example, we bring in
25 speakers, and anyone who is interested can go and

36

1 listen. In my previous experience that would only be
2 allowed if you were working directly related because
3 of the contract was -- was run by a for-profit
4 corporation, and their interest was only profit. And
5 I am concerned that if that happens here, property
6 values are really going to take a plunge, and people
7 in my situation are going to be stuck. I don't have
8 the option to leave and I'm going to end up owing more
9 on my house than what it's worth.

10 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.

11 MR. MIKE SOREM: Yes. My name is Mike
12 Sorem, and I have a couple of -- slightly different
13 way of looking at it. There's the issue that the DOE
14 views our pension program as too rich. I look at it
15 as the University of California and the pension
16 program at this Lab are what brings the top-notch
17 people here. And without those benefits you are going

18 to be getting second-stringers, third-stringers. You
19 know, people will come, but you will not get the same
20 personnel that the university in the past has
21 attracted.

22 I would also like to -- you know, as long as
23 we're sort of thanking the government for the nice
24 things they are doing -- I would like to mention that
25 the closing of the West Jemez Road is being proposed

37

1 in the name of security, is a severe blow to people
2 living in the mountains, people wanting to get to the
3 mountains, the local ski area that will have no
4 access.

5 Thank you.

6 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.

7 MR. KEN LAGATUDA: Hi. My name is Ken
8 Lagatuda, and I'm a TSM at the Lab, been here for 20
9 years. I would just like to point out that the
10 current contract describes in some detail the process
11 that is now taking place and perhaps in some way
12 predetermines it. It also refers to those entities

13 which have rights under the current contract. It
14 refers to them as the parties to the contract. Those
15 are the DOE, Los Alamos National Laboratory, UC, and
16 next contractor, whoever it maybe. We as employees
17 and retirees are not parties to the contract. We do
18 not have rights under the contract.

19 Now, yesterday Tyler referred to us current
20 employees and retirees, and in a context which sort of
21 intrigued me. He suggested -- he seemed to suggest
22 that we form or try to form a more coherent group to
23 address the Source Evaluation Board directly, as if we
24 might be in some way invited to become a party to the
25 contract.

38

1 I think that after this meeting there's
2 going to be an attempt to talk about that further, so
3 I just wanted to call people's attention to that.

4 MS. BETTY GUNTHER: Under the current draft
5 RFP, if there is a negotiated contract with a union in
6 effect, we are -- we are able to keep our contract
7 rights. So, UPTE is taking applications right now.

8 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Sure.

9 MR. KEN LAGATUDA: Thank you.

10 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Here we want to just
11 have -- Joe wanted a quick comment here on a follow-up
12 about the meeting?

13 MR. JOE LADISH: Can I -- it's just a
14 follow-on to this meeting.

15 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Joe, so you know on the
16 timing, we're going to try to wrap up in about 20
17 minutes, somewhere in that range, so if you want to at
18 that point set a place or time here for people to
19 meet?

20 MR. JOE LADISH: I just want -- the comments
21 are absolutely right on about a meeting following this
22 in this auditorium, essentially to try to look at this
23 issue of forming a consortium of players that include
24 all the interested parties, not retirees only,
25 employees only, community people only, but anyone that

39

1 might want to try to get input into the process.

2 Tyler told us after the meeting he would

3 open a channel that would not be filtered in the sense
4 that it has to go through somebody else, that would
5 include input from this group. After this meeting,
6 those that are interested are welcome to stay and help
7 try to organize that.

8 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Okay. Great.

9 MR. PETE SHEEHEY: Pete Sheehey. I'm
10 another one of those mid career people who feel -- may
11 feel obligated to retire just to preserve the benefits
12 we have. My feelings about UC management are mixed.
13 There have been problems. But the UCRP and the
14 benefits that we're entitled to under UCRP are an
15 example of good management by the University of
16 California. Those benefits are paid for and DOE has
17 not had to contribute to that retirement plan for many
18 years.

19 So in arguing to try to preserve the
20 benefits we have already received --

21 (Applause.)

22 -- I urge you -- point this out. That is an
23 example of good management, and this is a political
24 process. You are in the minority party, so there are

25 some limitations on what you can do, but Pete Domenici

40

1 in past years has worked on a bipartisan basis to get

2 the really important things passed. So I urge you

3 work with him.

4 These concerns about massive retirements

5 could really hurt the ability of this Lab to do what

6 we're asked to do. We're not asking for anything.

7 Future benefits may go down, but what we have earned

8 to date can be preserved, simple language saying,

9 earned benefits remain in UCRP. Perhaps make it an

10 option.

11 (Applause.)

12 Say the employee has the option to leave it

13 in there or roll it in. Language like that can be put

14 into the contract. If there's not clear language, a

15 lot of people are going to feel obligated to leave.

16 That's going to hurt the mission of this Lab.

17 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Very, very good

18 comment. Very good comment.

19 MR. BRUCE BARENTS: My name is Bruce

20 Barents. I'm a University of California employee at
21 the Laboratory, and my purpose in being here today is
22 I am concerned that the goal of the new contract is to
23 reduce the future value of the pensions for retirees
24 here by up to half. And there is talk of the years of
25 service pension multiplier being reduced from 2-1/2

41

1 percent down to 1-1/2 percent.

2 Rumors going around the Laboratory that up
3 to 3,000 people are looking at retiring. And if that
4 should happen to be true, that would be more than a
5 third of the University of California employees. That
6 would have a significant impact on the ability of the
7 Laboratory to perform its mission. And I hope that --
8 that with your help, working together with everybody
9 here today, making comments to the DOE website, that
10 we might reverse this situation.

11 I believe that many people are seriously
12 conflicted by what's going on. One of the reasons
13 that people have stayed on was with the incentive of
14 this good retirement plan that the University of

15 California has. If that is taken away, I believe the
16 impact to the Laboratory will be dramatic and very
17 negative.

18 So thank you for your help in helping us
19 hold on to this pension.

20 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I know how to
22 hold a mike close to my guitar, at least. I used to
23 play a base guitar, and as a friend of mine says, it
24 was the only instrument you could play, watch the
25 girls and chew gum, and I told him I didn't chew gum,

42

1 so -- anyway, thank you for coming. I would like to
2 expound on a couple of comments that I made last
3 night, because I'm very concerned with the future of
4 the Laboratory.

5 I mean, I agree with everyone here with
6 regards to the morale, the impact of the retirement
7 plan changes. They are very, very important.

8 But I asked myself the question why I came
9 here and I talked about that last night, and I would

10 like to expand on it a little bit for you.

11 Why did I come here? I had four job offers,
12 Purdue, Battelle, University of Iowa and here, and I
13 came here because I felt I could world class science
14 here. That's changing, unfortunately.

15 And what was it that gave us that quality of
16 science? Well, it was the University of California
17 and the people that were here at the time because it
18 was the University of California. Now, since I have
19 been here, and it's been almost 20 years now, I have
20 used that contact intensively to support our programs
21 through outreach.

22 I have had three collaborations with
23 University of California professors, two of which are
24 current. I am an adjunct professor at the University
25 of California Riverside. And the freshness to the

43

1 problems that we approach that UC brings is of
2 critical importance. I mean, after all, some of the
3 problems that we have been working on we have had 40
4 to 60 years without a solution. They require new,

5 fresh insights, and those contacts which this
6 outreach -- and I'm glad the gentleman mentioned the
7 freedom that this place gives us to bring outside
8 speakers and collaborators -- is extremely important,
9 and it doesn't necessarily exist at other
10 laboratories.

11 Now, in response to my comment, Tyler said
12 well, the Secretary of Energy believes that industry
13 could do this just as well. Well, he is not -- the
14 Secretary isn't sitting in my shoes, and I don't think
15 that's correct.

16 (Applause.)

17 I think that we need a strong -- we need a
18 strong institution that will support the
19 infrastructure for freedom of thought without a profit
20 motive. That will give us the latitude that we need
21 to solve these very important problems.

22 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. JOE REEKIN: Hi. I'm Joe Reekin. I'm a
25 staff member at the Lab, and I want to focus in on a

1 point that Tyler brought up yesterday. He had three
2 alternatives that he was proposing for us, and it's a
3 lot like what Bob Cares brought up, that we, one,
4 could transfer to the new employer, or we could retire
5 from UC, or we could terminate employment with UC now,
6 and then retire later with the UC benefit.

7 FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yes, but he doesn't
8 guarantee that you have a -- (inaudible).

9 MR. JOE REEKIN: That was discussed
10 yesterday, and that's quite right. He wasn't -- there
11 are not guarantees, yet.

12 Point I wanted to bring up which Tyler seems
13 to be unaware is that, well, hopefully the transfer
14 alternative will be very attractive. But the other
15 two alternatives, to retire now, in our case, if we
16 retire now, we -- for us mid 50s people, we lose that
17 factor, and so we lose that way. If we -- if we wait
18 to retire later and postpone retirement, then we can't
19 use our sick leave as service credit. So it's a
20 lose-lose situation, just like Debbie brought up when

21 she spoke.

22 So that situation is not yet handled. I

23 don't know of a way to deal with it. Perhaps UCRS

24 could be persuaded to change the terms for this

25 particular contract renewal in order to make that --

45

1 in order to provide an attractive alternative to one

2 of the UC alternatives.

3 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you.

4 MR. MATTHEW MURRAY: I am Matthew Murray. I

5 am 54 years old. I have worked here 30 years. I have

6 two years of sick leave saved up, and so I am in a

7 very difficult position as to what decision to make as

8 this process goes forward.

9 But I want you to think about something

10 else, and that is, people my age are going to retire

11 or expire in the next 15 to 20 years, anyway. What

12 about the people, the Ph.D.s that are in their 30s

13 and 40s that are going to replace the scientific staff

14 that are here now, as well as the administrators and

15 the support staff members and the technicians, because

16 you have got senior technicians that are in the same
17 issues, senior support people.

18 Over the Christmas break Ph.D.s in their
19 late 20s, 30s and early 40s, went to universities and
20 have returned with signed job offers in the fall. If
21 they leave what impact is that going to have on Los
22 Alamos' ability to do their mission?

23 The motto now is something about grave the
24 greatest science being applied, but I would like you
25 to ask your fellow people in Congress, does Los Alamos

46

1 National Laboratory represent the organization that
2 ensures the strategic security of the nation during
3 the next century and beyond? If that is true, then
4 you need to recruit young men and women from Long
5 Island, Idaho, Seattle, New Orleans, from the best
6 universities around the world, have them leave
7 grandma, grandpa and aunts, uncles, brothers and
8 sisters, raise their children in what they consider
9 the middle of nowhere, where it's difficult to have
10 relationships between their cousins and their grandmas

11 and grandpas. If you want to do that for an average
12 price, I say I don't think you can do it. If you want
13 the best, it's going to cost some money.

14 As you have heard about the retirement, the
15 pensions the people my age, why did they stay? Why
16 did we move here and stay? It was because of the
17 association with the University of California, because
18 we could make a difference, because we did it to serve
19 our nation.

20 Congress needs to decide what organization
21 is going to be the lead organization to ensure the
22 future strategic security of the nation, and then be
23 willing to pay for that, because it's not just people
24 my age that you need to worry about. I'm worried
25 about the people within my own group who I have seen

47

1 their signed job offers for. If they leave, I
2 question whether or not this Laboratory can do that
3 mission.

4 (Applause.)

5 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Thank you. Thank you.

6 Very good.

7 STAFF: Congressman, I'm over here. You

8 have really only five more minutes.

9 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Okay. Well --

10 STAFF: So whoever you want to handle that

11 next five minutes.

12 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Let's keep moving with

13 the comments here, and I'll just -- I think with --

14 let's see the hands on --

15 Okay. We can --

16 STAFF: We won't be able to take care of

17 everybody.

18 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Go ahead.

19 MS. MELANIE OWEN: My name is Melanie Owen.

20 Is it possible at this point for Congress or DOE to

21 terminate the bidding process and leave the contract

22 with the University of California?

23 (Applause.)

24 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Oh, I think they could.

25 Yes, they could. They definitely could do that. If

1 they wanted to, they could do it.

2 MR. PAUL GUTHELS: I think I'm on, so if you
3 want to listen to me first.

4 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: All right. Go ahead.

5 MR. PAUL GUTHELS: I'm Paul Guthels. I'm a
6 70-year-plus resident of the state of New Mexico,
7 40-years-plus in Los Alamos, and there has been a lot
8 of tremendous comments today which I would support
9 wholly. The one big one which keeps popping out of my
10 mind, and I have already sent you a copy, was to
11 continue what Los Alamos has made all of us proud of,
12 is a biggy. And looking at it from my whole history
13 in New Mexico and Los Alamos, continuing to get
14 outstanding people to come to Los Alamos is, I think,
15 the way to do business.

16 Thank you.

17 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Let's get a couple
18 more. Go right here in the middle.

19 MR. ERIC FAIRFIELD: My name is Eric
20 Fairfield, and I came here to do national security, I
21 came here to do very high end science, and I stayed to
22 get my daughter safely through high school. She is

23 now a senior at Berkeley. She is a physicist. She is
24 one of the people that this place should want to
25 recruit. So is her boyfriend, who is a computer

49

1 scientist. They are not planning on coming because
2 the place is broken.

3 One of the things that I do for my business,
4 I used to be a Lab staff member, and I now run a
5 business, is I do strategic analysis. I have done it
6 for bioinformatics, I have done it for microwaves.
7 The question is, what's going to happen three years
8 out.

9 I want this place to be high end security,
10 high end science. My prediction is that won't happen,
11 and the current RFP will ensure that it doesn't
12 happen.

13 (Applause.)

14 So, I want it changed. Like everybody here,
15 wonderful comments I got. I was asked to consider
16 being a division leader, and somebody said, the real
17 question is, if they give you the job should you take

18 it? The answer in March was no. The search is still
19 open. The answer is no, but if I -- actually, I
20 should take it, but the terms are higher. After
21 listening to Tyler and reading the RFP, I want cash.

22 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Let's go ahead here.

23 MR. ROGER PERKINS: My name is Roger
24 Perkins. I'm a retiree, came here in 1955 first
25 time. One thing that hasn't been brought up is the

50

1 fact that there is a threat that all retirees past and
2 present in the UC system will be transferred to a
3 different system in the event that the University of
4 California does retain the contract. And I guess I
5 have to say that I think that is quite a slap in the
6 face for people that have given service here over the
7 years, that they -- that they consider -- and this is
8 in paragraph H-37-E-2-iii, three Is. It's a very
9 brief paragraph, but the idea of removing pensions,
10 people having pensions -- survivors, disability
11 recipients, terminated vested and nonvested members --
12 that would include people that took inactive

13 membership -- all these people could be moved to a new
14 plan, and you know what the benefits are likely to be.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Yes. Yes. Go ahead.

18 STAFF: Tom, you can really only take one.

19 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: We're going to do one
20 more.

21 STAFF: You can blame your staff. Okay?

22 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Okay. Go ahead. Add
23 your sentence there.

24 MR. STEVE CHACLUSKI: Steve Chaccluski. I
25 was on the panel. Tyler did apologize for that and

51

1 say it would be removed from the final contract.

2 CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Okay. Okay. Thank

3 you. And I also have a -- a staff member here that

4 was here yesterday. I'm sure Joe and many of the

5 others will be able to share with individuals some of

6 the comments that occurred. Now, where is Johanna?

7 She is right back there in the back. If you all have

8 -- if you have questions about -- I'm sure Joe and
9 some of the others and Johanna are going to be able to
10 tell you some of the discussion that occurred
11 yesterday and some of the comments and changes and
12 possible things that they are exploring.

13 Let me just sum up by, first of all saying,
14 Joe, I think it's important that you continue as much
15 as possible, continue your group and anybody that
16 wants to get involved with it, because I think the
17 more we have, a real core group with the expertise and
18 with the ideas, we're going to be able to get some of
19 this done and get this RFP fixed. So, this is a very
20 important process here, I think, over the next couple
21 of weeks.

22 It really breaks my heart to hear somebody
23 say that young scientists would not come here. And --
24 and I just -- I can't tell you how strongly I feel
25 about that. I -- I think that this Laboratory has

1 been a treasure for the country. It has done some
2 truly remarkable things and made some remarkable

3 contributions to our security, to our growth, to our
4 economic development, to moving technology into new
5 areas, and we need to continue that. We truly, truly
6 need to continue that.

7 And your voices today will help me in the
8 process of letting the folks in Washington know that
9 -- that with this RFP and with the way they are
10 pursuing this, they are threatening the real -- the
11 unbelievable things that we have grown here and that
12 we have put together here, and it's fragile, and it
13 can be -- it can be disrupted.

14 So, I know there -- let me just -- final
15 word. I know there are others that were not able to
16 comment today. Please, as you put those comments in
17 to the website that's listed on the sheet that you got
18 out, send them to me also, because those will help me
19 and in working with this local group and working with
20 others that have been commenting in this process to
21 move this along and try to do everything we can to put
22 this on the right track.

23 As somebody said, we have got to fix it. We

24 have got to get this thing right, and it's just
25 enormously important for this community.

53

1 And as a final word -- I, for one, believe
2 if you are going to have world class science, you have
3 to pay for it. That's -- that is absolutely
4 critical. And so we shouldn't be trying to get things
5 on the cheap. We should say, what is it we need to
6 get world class science? What do we need in terms of
7 compensation, in terms of benefits, and we should lay
8 it out there and be willing to do that, and be willing
9 to stand up for it and defend it, and not have all
10 these -- these kinds of back-biting situations you
11 have mentioned where members of Congress outside of
12 this state take these different positions.

13 So, thank you for your participation. Joe,
14 are you going to start meeting with people right down
15 in here? Let's just say right in here.

16 And once again, you have truly reinforced to
17 me the specialness of this community. I mean, these
18 comments have been very substantive. They have --

19 they have been targeted, you have thought through
20 them, and I'm so happy that I did bring a court
21 reporter, because we have captured them, and it's
22 going to help me do my job a lot better.

23 Thank you very much.

24 (Applause.)

25 (The meeting concluded at 1:22 p.m.)

54

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO)

) ss

2 COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

3

4 C E R T I F I C A T E

5 I, MABEL JIN CHIN, New Mexico Certified Court
Reporter, do hereby certify that I did report in
6 stenographic shorthand the proceedings set forth
herein, and the foregoing is a true and correct
7 transcription of the proceedings.

8

9

Mabel Jin Chin, CCR
Certified Court Reporter #81
10 License Expires: 12/31/05

11 (1784AR-MC)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25